Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to have entered, and heard him with the multitude; or, had they been unwilling to do this, to have waited till he had finished his discourse, and then to have approached him, they call for him out; and this they do before all, exhibiting their excessive ambition, and wishing to show that they commanded him with great authority—a point which the Evangelist marks with disapprobation; for it was to intimate this that he said, 'Whilst he was yet speaking to the multitude;' as much as if he had said—What! was there no other opportunity? What! could they not have conversed with him in private? And what after all did they want to say? If it was on the doctrines of the truth, then it was right he should propound to all in common, and to speak before all, that others also might be benefitted. But if it was on other subjects of interest to themselves, they ought not to have been thus urgent. For if he would not suffer a man to bury his father, that his following of him might not be broken off, much more ought his address not to have been interrupted for things which were not of interest to him. Hence it is evident that they did this solely out of vain glory. And John shows this when he says—'Neither did his brethren believe on him!' And he records some words of theirs full of great folly, when he tells us that they took him to Jerusalem, not for any other purpose but that they might themselves derive glory from his miracles. If thou do these things, said they, show thyself to the world; for no one doeth anything in secret and seeketh himself to be conspicuous. At which time he rebuked them for this, reproving their carnal mind. For when the Jews reproached him, saying—'Is not this the carpenter's son, whose father and mother we know? and his brethren, are they not among us?' they, wishing to get rid of the charge, from the meanness of his origin, excited him to a display of miracles. He, therefore, gives them a repulse, wishing to heal their malady; since had he desired to deny his mother, he would surely then have denied her when they cast the reproach. On the contrary, he shows himself to have entertained so great care for her, that on the very cross he intrusts her to the disciple, who was his best beloved of all, and leaves many kind injunctions concerning her. But he does not so now, and that because of his care for her and his brethren; for since they approached him as a mere man, and were puffed up with vain glory, he expels that disease, not by insulting them, but by correcting them. . . . . And why did he chide her? He did not wish to excite doubt in her mind, but to remove the most tyrannical of passions, and, by little and little, to lead to a correct estimate of himself, and to persuade her that he was not only her son, but her sovereign Lord.* You will thus see that the rebuke was eminently becoming in him, and profitable to her, and withal contains much of mildness. So likewise when the woman cried out—'Blessed is the womb that bore thee,' he says not—'She is not my mother;' but, 'if she wishes to be blessed, let her do the will of my Father: for such a one is my brother, and sister, and mother!' Oh, how great an honour! How great a virtue! To what an exalted eminence does it carry one who embraces it! How many women have called that Holy Virgin and her womb blessed, and have longed to be such mothers, and to give up everything besides! What is there to hinder them? For behold he has cut out for us a broad way, and it is in the power not of woman only, but of man also to be placed in such a rank as that—rather in a much higher one; for this far more constitutes one his mother than did these labour pangs. So that, if that is a cause for calling one blessed, much more is this, inasmuch as it is paramount. Do not, then, merely desire, but also, with much diligence, walk along the path which leads to the object of your desire."

Here, then, we find St. Chrysostom imputing to the Blessed Virgin "excessive ambition," "vain glory," unbelief in her son. It was no wonder that the Benedictine editors, though they do not ordinarily give marginal annotations, here cannot keep silence, but exclaim "Fair words, Chrysostom," when even Calvin puts a construction on the passage far more honourable to the character of our Lord's mother. But, however we interpret this passage, we have said enough to show that Tertullian's interpretation was not heretical, but was followed by the most eminent doctors of the Church. And we have said enough to show that the views held in that age, with regard to the Virgin's character, were very different from those entertained in the Church of Rome. Now-a-days, men would fain represent her as free from *original* sin. In the fifth century, and, those preceding, the saints of the Church were so far from having any tradition to this effect, that they imputed *actual* sin to her without scruple. It seems needless to ask whether any of them addressed prayer to her. However, we hope in a future article to continue this investigation, in the case of the Fathers of the third century.*

ἐβούλετο γὰρ ἐνδείξασθαι τῷ δήμῳ, ὅτι κρατεῖ καὶ ἀνθεντεῖ τοῦ παιδὸς, οὐδὲν ὀυδέπω περὶ ἀυτὸν μέγα φανταζομένη· διὸ καὶ ἀκαίρως προσῆλθεν. Ὅρα γοῦν καὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐκείνων τὴν ἀπόνοιαν.

Nam quod illa fecit, ex *nimia ambitione* proficiscebatur; volebat enim populo sese ostentare ac si imperaret filio, de quo nihil adhuc magnum imaginabatur, ideoque importune accessit. Vide ergo et *ejus* (matris sc.) et fratrum *arrogantiam*.

* We also give the original text of this passage.

Ἀλλ' οὐχὶ νῦν τοῦτο ποιεῖ κηδομενος αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ προσεῖχονψιλῶ, καὶ ἐκενοδόξουν, τὸ νόσημα ἐκβάλλει, οὐχ ὑβρίζων ἀλλὰ διορθούμενος . . . καὶ τί βούλόμενος ἐπετίμα; οὐδὲ γάρ ἐξαπορῆσαι θέλων, ἀλλ' ἀπαλλαξαι τοῦ τυραννικωτάτου πάθους, καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐναγαγεῖν εἰς τῆν προσήκουσαν περι αὐτοῦ ἔννοιαν, καὶ πεῖσαι ὅτι οὐχὶ υἱὸς αὐτῆς μόνον ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ Δεσπότης.

At nunc non similiter facit, ut illi (matri sc) et fratribus suis recte consuleret. Quia enim illum nudum hominem censebant, atque *inani gloria* agebantur, morbum illum depellit, non ad contumeliam, sed ad emendationem. . . . . Et quid volens increpavit? Non enim ut illam (matrem, sc.) in dubium conjiceret, sed ut *a tyrannico morbo* liberaret, ac paulatim induceret ad congruentem de se opinionem, suaderetque ipsi, se non modo filium ipsius esse, *sed etiam Dominum*.

THE MORTMAIN COMMITTEE.

In our February number we noticed the well-known case of Metairie *v.* Wiseman, as illustrating the extent to which clerical influence is exercised by Roman Catholic priests in extorting dispositions of property in their favour from persons weakened by disease and old age. And we added the observation, that as the property so obtained was retained by those who, by their position, possessed undoubted control over the agents employed in the transaction itself, we have a right to assume that these means of procuring property are sanctioned by the doctrines and rules of that Church over which they preside. The next case pointing to the same conclusion, is that of Mr. Taylor, Weybridge. That gentleman, who had a family of two sons and three daughters, when in the 77th or 78th year, and in the full possession of health and vigour of mind, made his will, by which he gave the whole of his estate amongst his children, absolutely. About four years afterwards, when in his 81st year, and after a protracted illness of twelve months, and within three months before his death, in 1846, he made a new will, by which, after leaving all his property to his children successively, for their lives merely, the ultimate reversion in all was given to Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar Apostolic of the London district, and to his successors for the time being. And at the time of the discussion of this case before the Mortmain Committee, this ultimate reversion was vested in Dr. Wiseman.

The son of Mr. Taylor, from whose examination the foregoing facts are stated, and who is himself, of course, a Roman Catholic, states that, previous to the making of that last will, his father had stated to himself as well as to many others, that he would not think of leaving anything to the Church—that it was the most foolish thing in the world. He further stated, that at the time when his father first communicated to him his intention of making the will in favour of the Church, he could not think of reasoning with him on the subject, because he found him in that state that he was incapable of holding anything like an argument upon it; and that although naturally a very strong-minded man, from his long illness he had become exceedingly changed. As evidence of the extent to which that change had gone, he says that his father, at the same time that he declared the disposition he proposed to make, was for the benefit of his soul, and for the benefit of all their souls, assured him that he had left to his son personally £100,000, though his whole estate would not, if sold, realize anything like that sum, even including the devise to the Vicar Apostolic, and was, therefore, a mere delusion on the part of the testator.

Such was the evidence as to the circumstances under which this will was made. It did not appear by whom the will was suggested, nor whether there was any direct interference on the part of any spiritual adviser. It appears, also, that the other members of Mr. Taylor's family were so much under the clerical influence, and in so precarious a state of health, that Mr. Taylor, the gentleman examined, had determined to abstain from appealing to the law against the disposition made by his father.

In consequence of this indisposition on the part of the person most deeply interested in disputing the will, this case, at the time it occurred, did not come before the public. And the manner in which ultimately it was brought forward certainly reflects no little discredit on Cardinal Wiseman, and is, in our judgment, as remarkable an instance of equivocation as ever came before our notice.

It appears that in 1850, during the excitement consequent on what is called by Protestants the Papal aggression, the circumstances of the above case began to be whispered abroad. It was said that four children of an aged father had been disinherited, and that the Cardinal and his Church were to reap the benefit. Upon this an English Dissenter, a Mr. John Dean, who had heard the rumour, took the straightforward course of writing to the Cardinal, mentioning the report, and saying that he would be glad to be put in a position to contradict it. To this application the Cardinal did reply in a letter from which the following are extracts:—

"Dear Sir—I am much obliged for your manly and straightforward application to me. I never in my life saw nor spoke to nor corresponded with the late Mr. Taylor. I am not named in his will. Since coming to London I have had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Mr. Taylor's excellent family. I have visited them at Weybridge. I am on terms of perfect good understanding with Mr. James Taylor, the *supposed* disinherited son, who, with his sisters, enjoys every farthing of his father's property."

Now, could any one, after reading that letter, have for one moment supposed that Mr. Taylor had in truth made a will disposing of his property substantially in favour of the Church, and that that substantial gift was, at the very time of writing the letter, vested in the Cardinal? and yet the letter is so worded that it is verbally true. The gift was not by name to Cardinal Wiseman, but by description it then belonged to him. The son and his sisters did then enjoy every farthing of the present income of their father's property; but yet, if that property had then been sold and distributed between the tenants for life, and those entitled in remainder, two-thirds of the proceeds would have gone into the pocket of the Cardinal. Now, what meaning did Cardinal Wiseman intend to convey to his correspondent? Mr. Dean, unaccustomed to the casuistical refinements which draw a distinction between a denial "simpliciter" and a denial "secundum quid" forthwith sent the Cardinal's letter to a dissenting journal, "The *British Banner*," who at once published it, with observations denouncing the report in question, as a malignant lie. And we believe every honest-minded individual would have drawn a similar conclusion, and, trusting to the written statement of Cardinal Wiseman, have discredited the whole report.

Unfortunately for the Cardinal he trusted too much to the unwillingness of Mr. Taylor's son to bring before the public the wrongs that he had received; for, trusting to that gentleman's submission to his spiritual rulers, he incautiously ventured, in his letter to Mr. Dean, to refer to Mr. James Taylor, the son, as offering to give any contradiction he (Cardinal Wiseman) pleased to the calumny. This was going rather too far, and Mr. Taylor, although unwilling to involve himself and his family in litigation, still could not suppress altogether the feelings of disappointment and annoyance which his father's will had necessarily produced. He, therefore, published a letter, very different indeed in its tenor, from that which the Cardinal calculated on eliciting. He says:—"The bulk of my father's property is left to his children for their lives only; and upon their decease is given to the use of the late Dr. Griffith's, if living, and if not to the then Vicar Apostolic, for the London district, (then Dr. Wiseman) for the time being. The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whatever in favour of a wife or children; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at incumbrance or alienation. Such a will appeared to me to create not a *supposed*, but a real and effectual disinheritance; and such I have always felt it to be. I should add, that the will was executed by a most kind and affectionate parent, after he had attained the age of 80 years and upwards, and when his mind was affected by severe illness, and in immediate contemplation of that great change, the approach of which renders the strongest and best prepared *wholly unable to resist any influences which may be brought to assume the sanction of religion.*" Such is the mild unexaggerated statement of a son, who, when asked if there had ever been any interruption of filial confidence between him and his deceased parent, was able to answer—"I never to my knowledge had a word with him in the course of a long life."

And with such facts before us, may we not well urge our Roman Catholic brethren to examine diligently and earnestly the truth of those doctrines of their Church which place in the hands of the priesthood such powerful means of augmenting the wealth of the Church, at the expense and to the injury of those entitled by every tie of affection to the remembrance and consideration of their dying relatives? And ought they not vehemently to suspect the motives of those who, in maintaining these doctrines, thereby retain the power and ability of converting the fears and the weaknesses of their dying penitents into an unfailing fountain of wealth and influence for that great clerical corporation of which they form a part?

* The reader desirous of further information will find it in Mr. Tyler's work on the worship of the Virgin, in which he has collected with great industry the testimony of the Fathers on this subject. We have been much indebted to his work in these articles; and as far as we have followed his steps, we have not been able to find that he has omitted any important passage in which the Blessed Virgin is spoken of.

THE WORD "SACRAMENT."

The word "sacrament" only occurs *once* in the Douay Bible—viz., Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 32.

St. Paul wrote this epistle in the Greek language, and the word he wrote was *μυστηριον*; written in English letters this word would be "mysterion."